

SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
451 South State Street, Room 326
March 1, 2018

A roll is kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:33:06 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Historic Landmark Commission meetings are retained in the Planning Office for an indefinite period of time.

Present for the Historic Landmark Commission meeting were: Chairperson Charles Shepherd, Vice Chairperson Kenton Peters; Commissioners Stanley Adams, Sheleigh Harding, Victoria Petro-Eschler, David Richardson and Paul Svendsen. Commissioners Thomas Brennan, Robert Hyde, Esther Stowell and Rachel Quist were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Wayne Mills, Planning Manager; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Lex Traughber, Senior Planner; Lauren Parisi, Principal Planner; Michelle Poland, Administrative Secretary and Paul Nielson, Senior City Attorney.

FIELD TRIP NOTES:

A field trip was held prior to the work session. Historic Landmark Commissioners present were: Charles Shepherd and Kenton Peters. Staff members in attendance were Wayne Mills, Lauren Parisi and Lex Traughber.

- **690 N. West Capitol Street** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **629 and 633 East 800 South** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal

APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2018, MINUTES. [5:34:09 PM](#)

MOTION [5:34:18 PM](#)

Commissioner Harding moved to approve the minutes from the February 1, 2018. Commissioner Richardson seconded the motion. Commissioners Peters, Adams, Harding, Petro-Eschler, Richardson, and Svendsen voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR [5:34:45 PM](#)

Chairperson Shepherd offered his condolences to those that knew Cheri Coffey and asked to have a brief moment of silence in her honor.

Vice Chairperson Peters stated he had nothing to report.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT [5:35:51 PM](#)

Ms. Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager, reviewed the briefings with the City Council regarding the New Construction Text Amendments and the demolition ordinance and the next steps for those proposals. She reviewed the Otherside Academy Appeal and the next steps for the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the appeal process.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD [5:41:14 PM](#)

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Comment Period, seeing no one wished to speak; Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Comment Period.

[5:46:22 PM](#)

New Construction at approximately 690 N. West Capitol Street - Jacob Ballstaedt, Garbett Homes, is requesting approval for 10 single-family dwellings (twin homes) on their own individual lots at the above listed address in the Capitol Hill Historic District. The subject parcel is zoned SR-1A (Special Development Pattern Residential District). The subject property is within Council District 3 represented by Chris Wharton. (Staff contact: Lex Traughber at (801)535-6184 or lex.traughber@slcgov.com).

- a. **New Construction - This project request requires approval for new construction in an historic district. Case number: PLNHLC2017-00941**
- b. **Two Special Exceptions: Case number: PLNHLC2018-00096**
 - I. **The applicant requests that the building height be flexible and modified by up to five feet (5') from the average building height on the block face (26'1") to allow for building accommodation of cases where extreme cross slopes exist.**
 - II. **The applicant requests modifications of interior side yard wall height (maximum 16' in the SR-1A Zone) of up to six and a half feet (6'-6") for a maximum of 22'6", to allow for building accommodation of extreme cross slope conditions, particularly those affected by the area of the natural swale on the property.**

Mr. Lex Traughber, Senior Planner, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the request as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Why the middle units were higher than the other units in the proposal.

Mr. Jacob Ballstaedt, Garbett Homes, and Mr. Tyler Kirk, architect, reviewed the proposal, topography of the site and reasoning for the heights of the buildings. They reviewed the layout, fire access, setbacks, and how the proposal would fit and enhance the area.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The price range for the homes.
- If a site section east to west was developed.
- The driving factor for height of the sidewall.
- The number of units exceeding the height.
- The setbacks for the property.
- The parking and fire access for the development.

- The addition of curb, gutter and sidewalk on the east side of the property.
- The proposed retaining wall location and material.
- The floor to floor heights of the structures.
- The access to the yard space from the different floors of the homes.
- If options were explored for variation in scheme.
- The materials and windows for the proposal.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:16:42 PM](#)

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Louis Downey, Ms. Christine Contestalene, Mr. Bruce Shapiro, Mr. Megg Morin, Mr. Frank Pignanelli, Ms. Karen Brisendine, Mr. Michael Mower, Ms. Joan Degiorgio, Mr. Randall McNair and Ms. Lara McAllister.

The following comments were made:

- The examples given did not relate to the development.
- The proposal would overwhelm the character of the neighborhood.
- The overwhelming feeling of the houses would not fit.
- The sewage system, traffic and parking will be an issue.
- The underground hot spring system may cause an issue for the development.
- The hillside was constantly moving and the area was always wet.
- The biggest character defining feature, in the area, was open space.
- Destroying the visual open space was problematic.
- The denseness and monotony of the development would loom over the area.
- The houses in the neighborhood are single homes and the proposal did not fit.
- The development would over shadow the surrounding homes.
- The homes could be pushed back and almost hidden on the lots.
- The developer chose the site knowing it had the restrictions.
- The applicant had not presented how the project was compatible with the neighborhood.
- The proposal would not match the character of the neighborhood.
- The neighborhood was being invaded with monolithic townhomes.
- Options for different entrances need to be considered.
- The impact and height study was out of date.
- It was unreasonable to think the number of units could fit on the lot.
- Mistakes had been made in the area and more should not be made.
- The development was appalling and the developer gave nothing to the people to the neighborhood.
- Would be a massive wall of concrete and brick.
- The property was undevelopable.
- The development would reduce the value of the homes in the area.
- The proposal was placing a modern apartment building in a historic district.
- The appearance of the project was the biggest problem.
- The neighborhood had changed over time and was at a tipping point.

- Needed to look at all of the projects in the area as a whole and consider what the affect will be to the area.
- Need to hold everyone to the same standard.

Chairperson Shepherd read the following cards

- Ms. Stacy Waddoups – I'm concerned about safety and to increased traffic and narrow streets. When it snows or when there are garbage bins- it is tough to get through. It also seems out of character for neighborhood.
- Ms. Margret Chandler – project is too dense for area. Street cannot support traffic and parking.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Hearing.

The Applicants stated they appreciated the neighbors' comments and had tried to be sensitive to their feelings. They reviewed why the current proposal was chosen, the additional width of the street, the new sewer system that would be added and the study conducted on faults and water in the area. The Applicants addressed the repeating design, materials, building heights and why they decided on the proposed scheme.

The Commissioners and Applicants discussed the following:

- If there were options for the project that did not exceed the building height.
- How lowering the height would affect the proposal.
- The height of the garage doors.
- If the buildings could look differently, be shorter and still be profitable.
- The distance between each twin home.
- The landscaping and topography for the proposal.
- The front yard street scape with less exposed block wall.
- Breaking up the yards to make them look individual.
- If the proposal complied with the density of the area.
- The previous proposals for the property and who reviewed those proposals.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- The issues with the front yard elevations and need to make them look more individual.
- The retaining wall treatment was a concern as the wall was massive.
- The buildings were identical and needed to be variegated.
- Mirroring as a pair would be more appropriate than all five being the same.
- Needed more push and pull on the setbacks to fit the area.
- Adding the character of the neighborhood to the development was necessary.
- The contemporary design was great as it represented the new development.
- The window approach was appropriate.
- The development was indicative to future projects.
- What was the return to the community with the exception?
- What are the site sections and how they affect the neighborhoods?
- The proposal was not right for this area.

- To table, deny or approve the petition and what recommendation to give to the applicant.
- The special exceptions were not a great concern but there were standards that needed to be met.

The Commission stated they would like the Applicant to review the proposal and further address the following standards as stated on the Motion Sheet for the proposal:

- 1-d. Scale of a Structure: The size and mass of the structures shall be visually compatible with the size and mass of surrounding structure and streetscape.
- 3-b Rhythm Of Spacing And Structures On Streets: The relationship of a structure or object to the open space between it and adjoining structures or objects shall be visually compatible with the structures, objects, public ways and places to which it is visually related;
- 3-d. Streetscape; Pedestrian Improvements: Streetscape and pedestrian improvements and any change in its appearance shall be compatible to the historic character of the landmark site or H historic preservation overlay district.

MOTION [7:12:02 PM](#)

Commissioner Richardson stated based on the analysis and findings in the Staff Report for Certificate of Appropriateness involving new construction in a local historic district testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Commission deny the request for new construction located at approximately 690 N. West Capitol Street specifically the Commission finds that the proposed project does not comply with the standards as previously noted.

The Commission and Staff discussed what happened if the petition were denied or tabled.

The motion died for the lack of a second.

MOTION [7:14:37 PM](#)

Commissioner Harding stated in the case of PLNHLC2017-00941 and PLNHLC2018-00096, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission table the petitions to a future meeting to allow the applicant to address the concerns stated previously. Commissioner Adams seconded the motion. Commissioners Peters, Adams, Harding, Petro-Eschler, Richardson, Stowell and Svendsen voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

The Commission took a short break. [7:16:19 PM](#)

The Commission reconvened. [7:21:12 PM](#)

Commissioner Petro-Eschler left for the evening

WORK SESSION 7:21:15 PM

Wasatch Community Gardens Rezone at approximately 629 and 633 East 800 South
- A work session will be held with the Historic Landmark Commission to discuss a proposal from Wasatch Community Gardens, represented by Ashley Patterson, to allow for the existing single-family homes on the site to be used as the organization's administrative offices. This request requires • Rezoning the subject properties from RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential) zoning district to the R-MU-35 (Residential Mixed-Use) zoning district, and • Amending the future land use designation in the master plan from Low Density Residential (1-15 dwelling units/acre) to Medium Residential/Mixed Use (10-50 dwellings units/acre) Because this is a work session and not a public hearing, a decision will not be made regarding these requests at this meeting. The Planning Commission will provide a recommendation to the City Council at a later meeting and the City Council will make the final decision. The subject properties are located in the Central City Local Historic District and Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff Contact - Lauren Parisi at (801)535-7226 or lauren.parisi@slcgov.com.) Case numbers: PLNPCM2018-00024 and PLNPCM2018-00025

Ms. Lauren Parisi, Associate Planner, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated that Staff is looking for comments from the Commission regarding the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Why the proposal was being brought to the HLC if they were not the decision making body.
- What businesses could be in the developments without the Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendments ?
- What could be constructed on the lots with the current zoning?
- The parking for the proposal.
- If the Planning Division should be looking at the area as a whole.

The Commission discussed the possibilities for future training or discussions. An email with further information will be sent to the Commissioners.

The meeting adjourned at 7:40:00 PM